

Monopoles and vortices in pure gauge theories and in Higgs theories

P. Suranyi

University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0011, USA

Abstract

Smeared Abelian and center gauges are introduced in pure non-Abelian lattice gauge theories. Popular Abelian and center gauges are limits of smeared gauges. Smeared gauges are also shown to be equivalent to Higgs theories. As a result, distributions and interactions of monopoles and vortices, which are objects responsible for confinement in pure gauge theories, can be studied by investigating classical solutions of Higgs theories.

PACS: 11.15Kc; 11.15Ha; 12.38Aw

Keywords: Confinement, monopoles, vortices, Higgs theories, lattice gauge theories

1 Introduction

Though there is no analytic proof of confinement in non-supersymmetric nonabelian gauge theories lattice simulations provide ample numerical evidence that nonabelian gauge theories confine quarks and gluons [1]. Considerable effort has been spent to understand the underlying physical mechanism behind confinement. The two most popular models, explaining the physical reasons behind confinement, are the dual superconductor model [2] and the Z_N vortex condensation model [3] [4] [5] [6].

Continuum gauge theories require gauge fixing. On the lattice, gauge fixing is not required, but possible. In the dual superconductor model the nonabelian part of the gauge is fixed, while a Cartan subgroup is not. As gauge fixing leaves behind a theory with Abelian gauge symmetry, this is called Abelian gauge fixing. The gauge fixing procedure has defects, which can be interpreted as monopoles. The gauge field, projected to its abelian components, and monopoles form a Coulomb gas that confines charged objects [1].

In the Z_N magnetic vortex model of $SU(N)$ gauge theories the gauge is fixed completely, except for the discrete center of the group, Z_N . This is called center gauge fixing. The defects of this gauge fixing are lines, representing magnetic fluxes, vortices, in three dimensional space. The condensation and percolation of vortices can be easily shown to lead to an area law of Wilson loops, which is tantamount to confinement.

Lattice studies of abelian projected theories [7] [8] found good agreement between numerical values of gauge invariant quantities (string tension, chiral condensate, etc.) obtained with and without abelian projection. This was assumed to be an indication of the validity of the dual superconductor picture.

Center projected pure lattice gauge theories [9] [10] [11] are Z_N gauge theories. Z_N gauge theories are theories of interacting vortices. Averages of Wilson loops and of other

gauge invariant quantities calculated in the projected Z_N gauge theory were also in good agreement with numerical values of gauge invariant quantities obtained without gauge fixing. This agreement implies that the center vortex picture is also a viable candidate for explaining confinement.

The analytic study of monopoles and magnetic vortices in pure gauge theories is, however, extremely difficult. Among existing studies, Polyakov's classical Coulomb gas model [12], and recent works defining vortices in the continuum [13] are of this nature. Strong coupling expansion [14] gives credence to the vortex condensation picture, as well. The analytic study of monopoles and vortices in gauge fixed pure gauge theories is very important. It is conceivable that finding an analytic proof of confinement may require an analytic proof of the existence and condensation of these classical objects in pure gauge theories.

Topological solutions, such as monopoles and vortices, appear in another class of theories under more controlled circumstances. Monopoles were found in Higgs theories with a single adjoint representation Higgs boson [15] [16] and vortices were found in Higgs theories with two or more Higgs bosons [17] [18] [19] [20], as topologically stable classical solutions.

In an earlier work we conjectured that monopoles and vortices found in gauge fixed pure gauge theories are connected with monopoles and vortices appearing as classical solitons in Higgs theories [21]. In this paper we intend to investigate this relationship and establish a firm link among these objects. Using the link between gauge fixed pure gauge theories and of Higgs theories the properties of monopoles and vortices and their interactions can be studied analytically in Higgs theories and the conclusions can be carried over to gauge fixed pure gauge theories.

We will rely on lattice realizations of gauge theories and Higgs theories throughout this paper. We will assume that at sufficiently small gauge coupling they are close to continuum theories. For the sake of simplicity we will only consider $SU(2)$ gauge theories, but our conclusions can be generalized to other nonabelian gauge theories without much difficulty.

2 Abelian gauge fixing and Higgs theories

We will first consider Abelian gauge fixing procedures in pure lattice gauge theories. The most popular gauges are the Maximal Abelian gauge (MAG) and the Laplacian Abelian gauge (LAG). These are opposite limits of a continuous set of gauge fixing procedures that we will define below. All of these procedures *use lattice gauge configurations generated without gauge fixing*.

MAG is defined [7] by maximizing a functional, S_{gf}^V , of the gauge field over gauge transformations, $V(\mathbf{r})$,

$$F_{\text{gf}}(U^V) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{r}, \mu} \text{Tr} \left[\sigma_3 U_\mu^V(\mathbf{r}) \sigma_3 U_\mu^{V\dagger}(\mathbf{r}) \right], \quad (1)$$

where $U_\mu^V(\mathbf{r}) = V(\mathbf{r}) U_\mu(\mathbf{r}) V(\mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\mu})$. $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ represents a lattice vector in the direction of the μ th axis.

For future purposes we rewrite $F_{\text{gf}}(U^V)$ in terms of quantities defined in the adjoint representation. As the choice of gauge is arbitrary we will choose $U_\mu(\mathbf{r})$ as a gauge field at

the maximum of $F_{\text{gf}}(U^V)$, at $V(\mathbf{r}) = e^{i\gamma_3\sigma_3}$. Then we write S_{gf}^V as

$$F_{\text{gf}}(U^V) = \sum_{x,\mu} g_{3a}^A(\mathbf{r}) U_\mu^{A,ab}(\mathbf{r}) g_{3b}^A(\mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (2)$$

where we defined the adjoint representation gauge transformation as

$$g_{ab}^A(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\sigma_a V(\mathbf{r}) \sigma_b V^\dagger(\mathbf{r})] \quad (3)$$

and the adjoint representation gauge field as

$$U_\mu^{A,ab}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\sigma_a U_\mu(\mathbf{r}) \sigma_b U_\mu^\dagger(\mathbf{r})].$$

g_{ab}^A and $U_\mu(\mathbf{r})$ are orthogonal matrices. Note that the Cartan (Abelian) subgroup of the gauge group leaves the vector g_{a3}^A invariant. In $SU(2)$ the normalized vector $g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r})$ fixes only two of the parameters of the gauge group.

LAG relaxes the constraint $\sum_a [g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r})]^2 = 1$ [8]. It maximizes (2) by finding the eigenvector of largest eigenvalue of the quadratic form defined by the right hand side of (2). The local normalization of the real vectors $g_{a3}(\mathbf{r})$ then determines the gauge transformation through (3). The conceptual advantage of LAG over MAG is that the trajectories of monopoles can be defined as singularities of the gauge fixing procedure, in agreement with the original ideas of 't Hooft [2]. At points where $g_{a3}(\mathbf{r})$ vanishes the gauge transformation becomes singular. These points define the world lines of monopoles in four dimensional space.

We introduce now a gauge, that interpolates between MAG and LAG, by defining a functional [21]

$$Z_A(U^V) = \int_0^\infty df(\mathbf{r}) f^2(\mathbf{r}) \exp \left\{ -\tilde{F}_{\text{gf}}(U^V, f) \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{F}_{\text{gf}}(U^V, f)$ is defined as

$$\tilde{F}_{\text{gf}}(U^V, f) = - \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \sum_{\mu} \left\{ f(\mathbf{r}) f(\mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\mu}) \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\sigma_3 U_\mu^V(\mathbf{r}) \sigma_3 U_\mu^{V\dagger}(\mathbf{r})] - f^2(\mathbf{r}) \right\} + \frac{\lambda}{\eta^2} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} [f^2(\mathbf{r}) - \eta^2]^2. \quad (5)$$

The prescription for finding the appropriate abelian gauge is *to find the maximum of $Z_A(U^V)$ in terms of the $V(\mathbf{r})$ (or rather g_{a3}^A) and $f(\mathbf{r})$* . The gauge defined by (4) is similar to the LAG gauge-fixing functional, in the sense that the optimal local vector $f(\mathbf{r})$ vanishes at certain points (or rather, owing to three constraints, on curves in spacetime). At these points the gauge transformation becomes singular. Just like in LAG, these points correspond to monopoles.

Notice now that the $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit is equivalent to MAG. Indeed, this limit freezes out the integration over $f(\mathbf{r})$ and leaves one with the exponential of (2), multiplied by η^2 . Furthermore, the $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ limit is equivalent to LAG. The introduction of the field $f(\mathbf{r})$ is equivalent to relaxing the constraint on the magnitude of the gauge group element in adjoint representation, due to the replacement $g_{3a}^A(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow f(\mathbf{r}) g_{3a}^A(\mathbf{r})$. Only the sum,

$\sum_{\mathbf{r}_a} f^2(\mathbf{r})(g_{0a}^A)^2(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{r}} f^2(\mathbf{r})$ is restricted, to make the integral finite. The general case of finite λ that interpolates between these two gauge fixing methods is also an appropriate Abelian gauge and will henceforth be called the general Abelian gauge (GAG).

Next we propose an alternative to GAG, a conventional gauge fixing term, S_{gf} , inspired by the functional $Z_A(U^V)$ and defined as

$$e^{-S_{\text{gf}}(U^V)} = Z_A(U^V)e^{-\tilde{S}}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$e^{\tilde{S}} = \int dV'(\mathbf{r}) Z_A(U^{V'}). \quad (7)$$

The integral of (6) over all gauge transformations is 1 and the modified action, $S = S_G + S_{\text{gf}}$, leads to the *same expectation value of all gauge invariant quantities as the original plaquette action*, S_G . We call this a smeared abelian gauge (SAG). Unlike in GAG, gauge configurations are understood to be generated in the presence of the gauge fixing term.

It is comparatively easy to establish the relationship between SAG and GAG. What is more important this relationship extends to non-gauge invariant quantities, such as gauge field configurations. Consider the Boltzmann factor in SAG,

$$e^{-S_G(U^V) - S_{\text{gf}}(U^V)}.$$

$S_{\text{gf}}(U^V)$ has a sharp minimum at $g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r}) = \delta_{a3}$. The integral in the denominator of (6) can be evaluated by the saddle point method in the nonabelian parameters of the gauge group. Up to a determinant, it gives $Z_A(U)$, the maximum of the numerator of (6), over $V(\mathbf{r})$. Though the integral of the Boltzmann factor over $U_\mu(\mathbf{r})$ is gauge invariant, $Z_A(U^V)$ will give an appreciable contribution to the integral over $U_\mu(\mathbf{r})$ only if $g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r}) \simeq \delta_{a3}$. Thus, when one generates an ensemble of gauge field configurations using the Boltzmann factor $\exp\{-S_G - S_{\text{gf}}\}$ one obtains only configurations that are very close to GAG configurations. The equivalence between GAG and SAG would become exact at $\eta \rightarrow \infty$.¹ In other words, at large η SAG is only slightly smeared around GAG.

We now consider SAG from a different angle. Aside from $\tilde{S}$, the action is just that of a traceless adjoint Higgs theory. To prove this statement, we use the gauge invariance of the measure, $dU_\mu(\mathbf{r})$, of S_G , and of $\tilde{S}$ to introduce an extra integration over gauge transformation V , and write the partition function as

$$Z = \int dV(\mathbf{r}) \int dU_\mu(\mathbf{r}) e^{-S_G(U) - S_{\text{gf}}(U^V)} = \int dU_\mu(\mathbf{r}) \int d\Phi(\mathbf{r}) e^{-S_G(U) - S_H(U, \Phi) - \tilde{S}(U)},$$

where we defined the Higgs action as

$$S_H(U, \Phi) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{r}, \mu} \text{Tr} [\Phi(\mathbf{r}) U_\mu(\mathbf{r}) \Phi(\mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\mu}) U_\mu^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) - \Phi^2(\mathbf{r})] + \frac{\lambda}{\eta^2} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\Phi^2(\mathbf{r})] - \eta^2 \right\}^2. \quad (8)$$

¹One can rescale function f by η and then it is easy to see that all values of f and g^A but those maximizing the gauge fixing term are frozen out.

Here we defined $\Phi(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_a f(\mathbf{r}) g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r}) \sigma_a$ and used the relationship

$$\int df f^2(\mathbf{r}) dV(\mathbf{r}) \sim \int d\Phi(\mathbf{r}) d\psi(\mathbf{r}), \quad (9)$$

where ψ is the Euler angle parameterizing the little group of $\Phi(\mathbf{r})$. Consequently, the integrand is independent of ψ . To prove (9) we use the representation of the Haar measure by Euler angles and (3).

Clearly, (8) is just a standard lattice Higgs action. To show that SAG is indeed equivalent to a Higgs theory we only need to investigate whether the presence of the term $\tilde{S}$, defined in (7), changes the nature of the action.

First of all, $\tilde{S}(U)$ is a gauge invariant function of the gauge field, $U_\mu(\mathbf{r})$. Though it is nonlocal, as we will show later, it becomes local in the relevant, $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, $g \rightarrow 0$ limit. It is also the generating functional of connected diagrams of an adjoint scalar field theory in a background gauge field, $U_\mu(\mathbf{r})$. It must be composed of gauge invariant combinations of the gauge field, Wilson loops. $\tilde{S}(U)$ also has the property of local Z_2 invariance, i.e. unlike the standard plaquette action it is invariant under the local replacement $U_\mu(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow -U_\mu(\mathbf{r})$. This is the property of a gauge action with an adjoint representation trace of the plaquette product of gauge fields.

To investigate the behavior of $\tilde{S}$ we first use a hopping parameter expansion [22]. That implies expanding the integrand in the hopping term, integrating over the gauge group, and re-exponentiating $\int dg(\mathbf{r}) Z_H^g(\lambda)$. The hopping parameter expansion assumes small η .

The leading nontrivial term of this expansion is

$$\tilde{S}(U) \simeq \frac{8(f_{\text{av}}^2)^4}{81} \sum_{\mathbf{r}_{\mu\nu}} |U_{\mu\nu}^P(\mathbf{r})|^2 = \frac{8(f_{\text{av}}^2)^4}{81} \sum_{\mathbf{r}_{\mu\nu}} [U_{\mu\nu}^{P,A}(\mathbf{r}) - 1]$$

where $U_{\mu\nu}^{P,A}(\mathbf{r})$ is the plaquette in adjoint representation and

$$f_{\text{av}}^2 = \frac{\int_0^\infty df f^2 e^{-(\lambda/\eta^2)(f^2 - \eta^2)^2}}{\int_0^\infty df e^{-(\lambda/\eta^2)(f^2 - \eta^2)^2}} \simeq \eta^2.$$

This adds a negative adjoint representation term to the usual plaquette term of the gauge action,

$$\frac{1}{g^2(a)} U_{\mu\nu}^P(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow \frac{1}{g^2(a)} U_{\mu\nu}^P(\mathbf{r}) - \Delta\beta_A U_{\mu\nu}^{P,A}(\mathbf{r}),$$

where in the leading order approximation $\Delta\beta_a = 8(f_{\text{av}}^2)^4/81$.

Provided the hopping parameter expansion is convergent, higher order terms can only have one of three effects:

1. They can renormalize $\Delta\beta_A$,
2. Loop terms larger than the plaquette (nonlocal terms) may appear in the adjoint representation,
3. Characters in higher order integer isospin representations may also appear.

Lattice gauge theories with actions mixing the characters of plaquettes in fundamental and adjoint representations have been studied thoroughly [23]. The conclusion of those investigations is that though such a modification of the action leads to new phase transition lines in the space of couplings. None of those transitions is deconfining. In the continuum limit, when all couplings tend to zero, all of these theories are equivalent to a nonabelian gauge theory with a modified coupling.

In fact, there is no real need to evaluate all these terms, as we can predict the resulting effective action using simple considerations. The inclusion of the gauge fixing term does not change the expectation value of any gauge invariant quantity of the pure gauge theory. These quantities are dependent only on the gauge coupling, or alternatively, on the scale of the running coupling, g . The lattice coupling runs as

$$\frac{1}{g^2(a)} - \frac{1}{g_0^2} \simeq 2\beta_G \log[\Lambda(a)/\Lambda_0],$$

where $\Lambda(a) \sim 1/a$ is the lattice scale and $\beta_G = 11/24\pi^2$; Λ_0 and g_0 refer to another, fixed scale.

The action is also equivalent to an adjoint Higgs action with an effective gauge coupling (the modification coming from the contribution of $\tilde{S}$), g_{eff} . The effective gauge coupling is such that the inclusion of the Higgs boson changes its running into that of the non-gauge fixed coupling, namely

$$\frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} - \frac{1}{g_0^2} \simeq 2(\beta_G + \beta_H) \log(\Lambda(a)/\Lambda_0),$$

where $\beta_H = 1/24\pi^2$. Physical quantities, depending on the gauge field only, must be the same when the Higgs theory action $S = S_G + \tilde{S} + S_H$ is used as when the S_G action is used alone. As, at small $g(a)$ these quantities are dependent only on the scale, $\Lambda(a)$, the scales in the two calculation must coincide. This leads to a relationship between the effective coupling and the original gauge coupling

$$g_{\text{eff}}^2(a) \simeq g^2(a) \frac{\beta_G}{\beta_G + \beta_H} = \frac{11}{12} g^2(a), \quad (10)$$

valid at sufficiently small $g(a)$.

Let us return now to the discussion of the non-locality of $\tilde{S}$.² We can show that the nonlocality goes away in the limit of $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ and $g \rightarrow 0$ (continuum limit), not only in the limit of $\eta \rightarrow 0$. This is the very limit in which SAG goes over into GAG and the lattice gauge theory goes over into the continuum theory. First of all, after rescaling $\Phi \rightarrow \Phi \eta$, we have $S_H \rightarrow \eta^2 \tilde{S}_H$, where $\tilde{S}_H$ is independent of η . As

$$\tilde{S} = \log \int d\Phi e^{-S_H},$$

the large η limit is equivalent to the semiclassical limit as η^2 plays the role of $1/\hbar$. In this limit only single loop terms contribute to $\tilde{S}$. In particular, all reference to the self-coupling

²The author is indebted to P. de Forcrand for calling his attention to this subject.

of the Higgs field, λ , is of $O(\eta^{-2})$, as it appears in multi-loop terms only. As the external fields in $\tilde{S}$ are gauge fields and the internal lines are Higgs propagators (there are no internal gauge lines!) all the couplings of the one loop term are gauge couplings. Then the calculation of $\tilde{S}$ is very similar to the calculation of the running gauge coupling using the background gauge field method [24]. Thus, among the one loop contributions to the logarithm of the functional determinant only diagrams with at most 4 background gauge fields are divergent. As it is shown on Ref. [24] the divergent contributions can be combined into the *local* term

$$\log \det \Delta = \int d^4x \left(\frac{1}{4} C (F_{\mu\nu}^a)^2 + \text{finite terms} \right),$$

where C is a logarithmically divergent constant, depending on the transformation properties of the field in the loop. When the running coupling is calculated [24] one must consider the contribution of the dynamical gauge field, the fermion fields, and the ghost field, as well. We only need to calculate a scalar field loop, so the contribution is slightly different. We obtain

$$\tilde{S} = -\frac{1}{2} \log(a\Lambda_{\text{lattice}}) \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \int d^4x (F_{\mu\nu}^a)^2 + \text{terms finite at } a=0,$$

where the scale was chosen to be Λ_{lattice} . As in the scaling limit, the gauge coupling in the pure gauge term scales with the lattice parameter as

$$\frac{1}{g^2} = \beta_G \log \left(\frac{1}{a\Lambda_{\text{lattice}}} \right).$$

$\tilde{S}$ combines with S_G to result in the replacement of g^2 by g_{eff}^2 , as indicated in (10). At large η and in the continuum limit the role of $\tilde{S}$ is to renormalize the gauge coupling. Then, in the continuum limit, at large η , the gauge fixed pure gauge theory is indeed equivalent to a Higgs theory. It is clear that at smaller values of η or/and at larger gauge coupling nonlocal effects are more pronounced and $\tilde{S}$ is dependent on the parameters of the Higgs potential. Nonlocal effects are of $O(1/\log(a\Lambda))$ and of $O(\eta^{-2})$. We have also seen, however, that in the continuum limit at small η these theories are also equivalent.

The equivalence of these lattice theories does not alone provide an obvious relationship between monopole configurations found in them, as the monopoles themselves are not gauge invariant objects. To prove such an equivalence we need to examine not only partition functions but also Boltzmann factors.

Assuming that the gauge coupling is small enough to apply continuum scaling, gauge configurations of the continuum theory and the lattice theory are essentially equivalent. To find classical solutions of the continuum theory we need to minimize the action in terms of the fields. The maximum of the Boltzmann factor should be calculated by minimizing $S_G + \tilde{S} + S_H$ in terms of the gauge fields and gauge transformations, as well. This minimization is equivalent to the minimization in terms of the Higgs field and the gauge field. In the continuum limit this minimization should lead to a combination of configurations containing a variable number of finite energy classical solutions, monopoles [15] [16]. Monopoles are identified by the radial dependence of the magnitude of the Higgs field. The magnitude of the Higgs field itself is gauge invariant. The final step in identifying the monopoles with those of GAG is the diagonalization of the Higgs field with a gauge transformation.

The conclusion of the above considerations is that

1. The appearance of monopoles in gauge fixed pure gauge theories follows from their existence in Higgs theories.
2. The analytic form, interaction, condensation, etc. of monopoles should be very similar to those in Higgs theory.
3. The mechanism of confinement, provided monopoles are responsible for it, is the same in pure gauge and Higgs theories.

Before turning to vortices let us apply our method to calculate the distribution of a single monopole in Abelian projected GAG. To do that we take the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole and diagonalize the Higgs boson by a gauge transformation. The gauge and Higgs fields are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) &= \mathbf{r} \times \boldsymbol{\sigma} F(r), \\ \Phi(\mathbf{r}) &= \mathbf{r} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} W(r),\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

where $F(r)$ and $W(r)$ are the radial wave functions.

Then the abelian gauge transformation is a rotation around the z axis by an angle $-\phi$, followed by a rotation around the y axis by an angle $-\theta$, where ϕ and θ are polar coordinates. Applying the same gauge transformation to the gauge field and projecting to the abelian component we obtain (we set the gauge charge equal to 1)

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}[\sigma_z(UA_\mu U^\dagger + iU\partial_\mu U^\dagger)] = \frac{z}{r}\partial_\mu\phi.$$

The magnetic field obtained from this vector potential is that of a single magnetic charge at the origin

$$\mathbf{B} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{r^2} + \text{Dirac string}.$$

It is worth noting that the abelian projection of gauge field (11) *without abelian gauge fixing* leads to

$$A_\mu(\mathbf{r}) = \partial_\mu\phi r^2 F(r),$$

that is a more like a vector potential for a magnetic flux than for a monopole.

3 Central gauges and Higgs theories

Now we turn to center gauges and vortices. Lattice studies have shown the relevance of Z_2 vortices in pure lattice $SU(2)$ gauge theory. These studies use two alternative gauges, the Maximal Center gauge (MCG) [9] and the Laplacian Center gauge (LCG) [10] [11]. The gauge transformations are followed by center projection.

MCG is defined through the maximization of the following functional (we use notations, identical to the ones used for the discussion of Abelian gauges) over gauge transformation $V(x)$:

$$F^C(U) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{x\mu} |\text{Tr} U_\mu^V(\mathbf{r})|^2 = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\mathbf{r}_\mu} \text{Tr} \left[\sum_i^3 \sigma_i U_\mu^V(\mathbf{r}) \sigma_i U_\mu^{V\dagger}(\mathbf{r}) \right].\tag{12}$$

$F^C(U)$ can be rewritten in terms of adjoint representation quantities as

$$F^C(U) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{\mathbf{r}_\mu} \sum_{iab}^3 g_{ai}^A(\mathbf{r}) U_\mu^{A,ab}(\mathbf{r}) g_{bi}^A(\mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\mu}). \quad (13)$$

If one writes the gauge field in the canonical form

$$U_\mu^g(\mathbf{r}) = a_0 + i\mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma},$$

where $a_0^2 + \mathbf{a}^2 = 1$, then $F^C(U) = \sum a_0^2$. The maximization of $\sum a_0^2$ results in a gauge field as close to the center of the gauge group ($a_0 = \pm 1$) as possible.

In fact, it is sufficient to keep only two terms of the sum over i in (12) and (13), as the adjoint representation gauge transformation is defined uniquely by two of the orthogonal vectors g_{a1}^A and g_{a2}^A . This is used in LCG, which relaxes the normalization and orthogonality conditions on the vectors g_{ai}^A . Vortices are found at points where the two vectors are parallel. These points form lines in three dimensional space. At these points the gauge transformation is singular. In what follows we will restrict ourselves to such two term gauge fixing functionals, though everything what we do can easily be generalized to the three term case, such as the original MCG.

MCG and LCG can again be extended into a Generalized Center Gauge (GCG), which also fixes the gauge, up to the center of the $SU(2)$ gauge group, Z_2 . A convenient form for the gauge fixing functional is

$$Z_C(U^V) = \int d\Phi^1(\mathbf{r}) \int_0^\infty df(\mathbf{r}) \rho^2(x) \exp \left\{ -\tilde{F}_{\text{gf}}(U^g, f) - S_H(U, \Phi^1) - S_{\text{mix}}(V, f, \Phi^1) \right\} \quad (14)$$

where $\tilde{F}_{\text{gf}}(U^V, f)$ and $S_H(U, \Phi^1)$ were defined in (5) and (8), respectively, while the ‘mixing term’ is given by

$$S_{\text{mix}}(V, f, \Phi^1) = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}}{\eta^2} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} [f(\mathbf{r}) g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r}) \Phi_a^1(\mathbf{r}) - c\eta^2]^2,$$

where c is the cosine of the asymptotic angle between g_{a3}^A and Φ_a . When we maximize (14) in terms of $V(\mathbf{r})$ and $f(\mathbf{r})$ we obtain an abelian gauge. The exponent will be dominated by the configuration of the Higgs field, gauge transformation, and $f(\mathbf{r})$ that maximizes the exponent. In contrast to the Abelian gauge fixing of the previous section this limit fixes the abelian gauge group, as well. The Abelian subgroup is fixed by a rotation around the 3rd axis (the little group of $g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r})$), such that $\Phi_2^1(\mathbf{r}) = 0$. Vortices appear on lines in the 3D space where $\Phi_a^1(\mathbf{r})$ is parallel with $g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r})$ and where such a gauge fixing is impossible. Alternatively, in a slightly more symmetric manner, we could also define the gauge transformation by rotating the sum of the normalized Higgses parallel to the z axis and rotating the difference into the (xz) -plane.

When $c = 0$ and $\lambda, \tilde{\lambda} \rightarrow \infty$ GCG reduces to MCG (or rather an analogous 2 term gauge), as $\Phi_a^1(\mathbf{r})$ is kept normalized to η and orthogonal to $g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r})$. When $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$ GCG reduces to LCG.

Next we introduce the smeared center gauge (SCG) such that the gauge fixing term in the Lagrangian is defined as

$$e^{-S_{\text{gf}}} = Z_C(U^g) e^{-\tilde{S}},$$

where

$$e^{\bar{S}} = \int dV'(\mathbf{r}) Z_C(U^{V'})$$

In a manner similar to our discussion of Abelian gauges we can show that on large lattices SCG is very close to GCG and we can also show that SCG is completely equivalent to a lattice Higgs theory with two adjoint Higgses. This follows because after a gauge transformation one can introduce the second Higgs field as

$$\Phi_a^2(\mathbf{r}) = V(\mathbf{r}) g_{a3}^A(\mathbf{r})$$

and prove that the action can be written as $S = S_G + S_{\text{gf}} = S_G + \bar{S} + S_H^2$, where S_H^2 is a Lagrangian for two adjoint Higgses. $S_G + \bar{S}$ is again a modified pure gauge action. The modified gauge coupling should be equal to the standard pure gauge coupling minus the contribution of two adjoint Higgs bosons, as S is equivalent to a gauge fixed version of the pure gauge theory. Thus the relationship between the gauge couplings is $g_{\text{eff}}^2(a) \simeq (11/13)g^2(a)$.

The Boltzmann factor of the GCG must be dominated by vortex configurations, if the Boltzmann factor of the Higgs theory is. To make the connection between GCG and SCG distributions we need to fix the vortex gauge such that one of the Higgs bosons is rotated parallel to the 3rd axis in isospace while the second Higgs boson is rotated into the 1–3 plane. Thus, the ‘thick’ vortices appearing in GCG have the same location and radial dependence as the vortices of the Higgs theory.

To illustrate the equivalence of GCG and SCG we calculate the shape of a single vortex in center gauge fixed pure gauge theory, by making use of a classical solution of the Higgs theory with two adjoint Higgs bosons [21]. The solution is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{1,2}(\mathbf{r}) &= U(\phi)[\chi_d(\rho)\sigma_3 \pm \chi_\perp(\rho)\sigma_1]U^\dagger(\phi), \\ A_\mu(\mathbf{r}) &= a(\rho)\partial_\mu\phi\sigma_3, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where the boundary conditions require that $\chi_\perp(0) = a(0) = 0$ and $a(\infty) = 1$, the topological charge. ρ and ϕ are cylindrical coordinates, along with z and

$$U(\phi) = e^{i\phi\sigma_3/2}.$$

The normalized components of the Higgs field also satisfy boundary conditions at infinity: $\chi_\perp(\infty) = \sqrt{(1-c)/2}$, $\chi_d(\infty) = \sqrt{(1+c)/2}$. c is the angle between the two Higgs bosons at infinity. (15) satisfies the constraint that the two Higgs fields become parallel at the location of the vortex, along the z axis. The z axis is also the locus of the singularity of $U(\phi)$.

To predict the form of a thick vortex on the lattice, in pure gauge theory, we need to bring the Higgs bosons to a standard form. This is the form in which the fields have only components in the (xz) plane and the sum of the Higgses is diagonal. To get to that form we need to use the singular gauge transformation $U^\dagger(\phi)$. As U commutes with the gauge field of (15) the only change of the gauge field will be the addition of the inhomogeneous term, $iU^\dagger\partial_\mu U$. This will result in the following change in the gauge field (the gauge charge has been set equal to unity):

$$A_\mu(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow A_\mu(\mathbf{r}) + iU^\dagger\partial_\mu U = [a(\rho) - 1]\partial_\mu\phi\sigma_3.$$

The gauge field remains diagonal after the gauge transformation. It is singular on the z -axis and it goes to zero exponentially at $\rho = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \rightarrow \infty$.

To understand what happens on the lattice and after center projection we rewrite the Higgs fields, the vector potential, and the gauge transformation into a form appropriate for the lattice. The Higgs field (15) is already in such a form. The lattice gauge field is a unitary matrix. The gauge field in (15) can be conveniently written as

$$U_\mu(\mathbf{r}) = \exp \left\{ \frac{i}{2} a(\rho(\mathbf{r})) [\phi(\mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \phi(\mathbf{r})] \sigma_3 \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ and $\phi(\mathbf{r})$ are the cylindrical coordinates at lattice points. The singular gauge transformation that brings the Higgs field into the (xz) plane is

$$V(\mathbf{r}) = \exp \left\{ \frac{i}{2} \phi(\mathbf{r}) \right\}.$$

Thus, the gauge transformed gauge field is

$$U_\mu^V(\mathbf{r}) = V(\mathbf{r}) U_\mu(\mathbf{r}) V^\dagger(\mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \exp \left\{ \frac{i}{2} [a(\rho(\mathbf{r})) - 1] [\phi(\mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \phi(\mathbf{r})] \sigma_3 \right\}.$$

Let us examine the gauge field near the z axis. At $\rho \sim 0$ the radial component of the original gauge field is negligible, $a(\rho) \sim \rho^2$, and the new gauge field has the form of a pure gauge transformation. When one traverses around the z axis one needs to define a surface in the three dimensional space, with a boundary at the z axis, such that on this surface the value of $\phi(x)$ jumps by 2π . This surface can be chosen arbitrarily, so we choose the half- (xz) plane containing the negative half of the x axis. If the gauge coupling small, the argument of the gauge field $U_\mu(x)$ is small and at central projection projects to the identity matrix. When we intersect the half plane, however,

$$U_y(\mathbf{r}) \simeq e^{\frac{i}{2} [\pi - (-\pi)]} = -1,$$

and the gauge field projects to the non-trivial element of the center, -1. This sheet of negative elements of the center ends in the z -axis, where a Z_2 vortex appears. Thus, we showed that in the center gauge, after center projection a Z_n vortex appears wherever a vortex appears in the Higgs theory. At the same time we have given a representation for the thick vortex, obtained after transformation to center gauge, but before center projection.

Strictly speaking, a secondary vortex also appears at some distance from the z axis. The location of that vortex is determined by the equation

$$a(\rho) - 1 \simeq \frac{1}{2},$$

which ensures that the jump of the argument of U_μ is smaller than $\pi/2$. At large ρ the radial component of the gauge field $a(\rho) \sim e^{-m_A \rho}$, where the auxiliary gauge mass, $m_A = g(a)\eta$. Then the secondary vortex will appear at $\rho \sim 1/m_A$. If, in the continuum limit, $g(a)$ is sufficiently small then this vortex will be far away from the z axis, not affecting the

confinement picture. The location of the primary vortex is gauge invariant and of the secondary vortex depends on the gauge. On the contrary, if we perform the center projection without transforming (15) to center gauge, then the Z_2 vortex does not appear at the z axis, we would only have the above described secondary vortex and the simple vortex condensation picture would not be recognizable.

4 Conclusion

We have shown that pure gauge theories in Abelian or Center gauges are equivalent to Higgs theories with one or more adjoint representation Higgs bosons. The equivalence extends to gauge configurations. Monopoles and vortices and their interactions, condensation, etc. in gauge fixed pure gauge theories can be studied analytically by investigating similar objects in Higgs theories, where they appear as classical solutions.

We encounter a problem when we apply our method of connecting pure gauge theories with Higgs theories in the limiting cases of Maximal Abelian and Maximal Center gauges. Then our construction leads to gauged nonlinear sigma models. As far as we know, the relevant gauged nonlinear sigma models do not have classical solutions in 3+1 dimensions. The reason is simple: Higgs fields in nonlinear sigma models cannot vanish. In gauged linear sigma models the location of the zeros marks the center of monopoles or vortices. This is, of course, in agreement with the fact that monopoles and vortices do not appear as singularities of the gauge transformation in MAG and MCG either. It would be interesting to investigate, using nonlinear sigma models, why the projected theories still show many of the characteristics found in General Abelian and General Center gauges.

The link between gauge fixed pure gauge theories and Higgs theories can be employed to investigate important questions concerning confinement. One example that comes to mind is the recently uncovered intriguing relationship between monopole and vortex condensations [25] [26]. Simulations show that monopoles do not form a Coulomb gas as was originally assumed, but rather they line up to form vortices, thereby making vortices more fundamental for the mechanism of confinement.

Another important question is why multiple non-abelian vortex configurations appear at all. 't Hooft's argued [27] that in a $SU(2)/Z_2$ theory the homotopy group has only one non-trivial class, so vortices should coalesce into a single vortex or no vortex at all. The situation is somewhat different in $U(1)$ gauge theory where the homotopy group is Z , and infinitely many kinds of vortices exist. Lattice evidence supports, however, the existence of multi-vortex configurations. It is conceivable that studying interactions of vortices in Higgs theories one will be able to answer this important question, as well.

The author thanks the U.S. Department of Energy for partial support through grant #DE FG02-84ER-40153.

References

- [1] See e.g. M. Creutz: *Quarks, gluons, and lattices*, Cambridge, United Kingdom (1983).

- [2] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. Nucl. Phys. **B190** (1981) 455.
- [3] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B138** (1978) 1.
- [4] H. Nielsen and P. Olesen, Nucl. Phys. **B160** (1979) 380.
- [5] J.M. Cornwall, Nucl. Phys. **B157** (1979) 392.
- [6] G., Mack, in *Recent Developments in gauge Theories*, ed. G. 't Hooft et. al. Plenum, New York (1980).
- [7] A.S. Kronfeld, M.L. Laursen, G. Schierholz, and U.-J Wiese, Phys. Lett. **B198** (1987) 516.
- [8] A.J. van der Sijs, Prog.Theor.Phys.Suppl. **131** (1998) 149.
- [9] L. Del Debbio, M. Faber, J. Greensite, and Š. Olejník, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **23** (1997) 141.
- [10] C. Alexandrou, M. D'Elia, and P. de Forcrand, Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl. **83** (2000) 437.
- [11] P. de Forcrand and M. Pepe, Nucl.Phys. B598 (2001) 557.
- [12] A. Polyakov, *Gauge Fields and Strings*, Harwood, Chur, Switzerland, (1987).
- [13] M. Faber, J. Greensite, and S. Olejnik, JHEP **6** (2000) 41.
- [14] M. Engelhardt and H. Reinhardt Nucl.Phys. **B567** (2000) 249.
- [15] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B79 (1974) 276.
- [16] A. Polyakov, JETP Lett. **20** (1974) 194.
- [17] H. de Vega, Phys. Rev. **D18**, 2932 (1978).
- [18] P. Hasenfratz, Phys. Lett. **B85**, 338 (1979).
- [19] A.S. Schwartz and Yu. S. Tyupkin, Phys. Lett. **B90**, 135 (1980).
- [20] H. De Vega and F. Schaposnik, Phys. Rev. **D34** (1986) 3206.
- [21] P. Suranyi, Phys. Lett. **B481** , (2000) 136.
- [22] see e.g. I. Montvay and G. Münster, *Quantum Fields on a Lattice*, Cambridge, United Kingdom (1994).
- [23] G. Bhanot and M. Creutz, Phys. Rev. **D24** (1981) 3212.
- [24] see e.g. M.E. Peskin and D.V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field theory*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts (1995).
- [25] L. Del Debbio, M. Faber, J. Greensite, and S. Olejnik, in *New Developments in Quantum Field Theory*, ed. P.H. Damgaard and J. Jurkiewicz (Plenum Press, New York-London, 1998)
- [26] J. Ambjorn, J. Giedt, and J. Greensite JHEP **2** (2000) 33.
- [27] G. 't Hooft, in *Particles and Fields*, eds. D. H. Boal and A. N. Kamal, Plenum, New York (1978).